DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 654 SO 016 351

AUTHOR McConnell, Stephen C.; And Others
TITLE Psychologists' Attitudes and Behaviors Regarding Nuclear Arms.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (92nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 24-28, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; *Attitude Measures; Attitudes; Behavior; Disarmament; *Nuclear Warfare; Peace; *Psychologists; Social Science Research; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *American Psychological Association

ABSTRACT

This survey examined the attitudes and behaviors of the 297 members of the American Psychological Association (APA) who responded to a mail survey of 1,000 members concerning a 1982 APA resolution calling for a nuclear freeze, a return to a productive civilian economy, and other issues related to nuclear arms. The attitudes and behaviors of the membership were found to be in agreement with the resolution. The majority were active in reading relevant literature, signing petitions, and engaging in informal discussions with others. Psychologists with a humanistic/existential orientation were most likely to have attitudes supportive of nuclear freeze and disarmament. Psychologists with children and older psychologists were likely to support peace organizations. Not wanting to survive a nuclear war was related to antinuclear activities. No differences in attitudes and behaviors were found for the following variables: professional identification, gender, and personal experience of war. (Author/IS).

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED256654

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Stephen C. McConnell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Psychologists' Attitudes and Behaviors Regarding Nuclear Arms

Stephen C. McConnell, Sharon D. Brown, James N. Ruffing,
Janet K. Strupp, Lawrence A. Kurdek

School of Professional Psychology

Wright State University

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (92nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 24-28, 1984).

SP 016 351

Running Head: NUCLEAR ARMS

Abstract

In August 1982, the American Psychological Association Council of Representatives passed a resolution for a nuclear freeze and a return to a productive civilian economy. This survey examined the attitudes and behaviors of 297 APA members concerning the Council resolution and issues related to nuclear arms. The attitudes and behaviors of the APA membership were found to be congruent with the stance posited by the resolution. Psychologists with a Humanistic/Existential orientation were most likely to have the attitudes supportive of nuclear freeze/disarmament. Psychologists with children and older psychologists were likely to support peace organizations. Not wanting to survive a nuclear war was related to anti-nuclear activism. No differences in attitudes and behaviors were found for the following variables: professional identification, gender, and personal experience of war.

A Survey of Psychologists'

Attitudes and Behaviors Regarding Nuclear Arms

Beginning with the bombing of Hiroshima in 1945, the awareness that humanity has the capacity to annihilate itself has permeated our social consciousness. The trend has been, and continues to be, a self-perpetrating proliferation of nuclear weapons by world powers in an attempt to deter aggressive actions by opposing countries.

Individuals and groups within our society have become concerned and actively involved in opposing this nuclear build-up. Indeed, a Gallup poll in June 1981 showed that 72 percent of the American public wanted the U.S. and U.S.S.R. to stop building nuclear weapons (Rogers, 1982). Thus, there is popular support for a proposal that both nations halt the testing, production, and further deployment of all nuclear weapons in a way that can be checked and verified by both sides.

The profession of psychology has not been exempt from the concern and controversy surrounding nuclear build-up. Psychologists have become involved on both individual and group levels. Activists have included such prominent people as Jerome Frank (1982), Robert Lifton (1982), Carl Rogers (1982), and B.F. Skinner (Staff, 1983). On the group level, the nuclear concern has become the focus for national groups such as Fate of the Earth, Psychologists for Social Responsibility, the Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility, and the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, in addition to a variety of groups at state and local levels.

In the midst of this social climate, concerned American Psychological Association (APA) members urged various boards within the APA governing structure to take action to decrease the likelihood of nuclear war. As a result, on August 25, 1982, the APA Council of Representatives passed the following resolution for a nuclear freeze and a return to a productive civilian economy:

1) Calls upon the President of the U.S. to propose to the U.S.S.R. that together, both countries negotiate an immediate halt to the nuclear arms race. Specifically, we call upon each country to adopt an immediate mutual freeze on all further testing, production, and deployment of all nuclear warheads, missles and delivery systems; and
2) Calls upon the Administration and the Congress to transfer the funds saved to civilian use. Concurrently, they should work jointly with labor, management and local communities to develop plans to convert the nuclear arms industry to civilian production thus protecting jobs and strengthening our national economy. We hereby call upon elected officials at local, state, and federal levels publicly to endorse this resolution (Abeles, 1983).

The Council also called on APA members to support peace initiatives within their local psychological associations or psychology groups outside their formal associations. "If there are none, start one" (Staff, 1982).

This action by the Council generated much controversy and emotionally laden reactions among APA members, as reflected in letters

to the editor published in the APA Monitor, discussions at professional meetings, and informal discussions among professionals. Some psychologists believe that nuclear concerns are of a political nature and as such, are outside the realm of professional involvement. Additionally, there are many individuals (and groups) within the psychological community who believe that sufficient research data are lacking to warrant public presentations on nuclear arms issues.

Other psychologists, however, believe that our stated professional mission of promoting and protecting human welfare necessitates active involvement in influencing public opinion and social policy. Furthermore, there are those who believe that as a profession, psychology does have expertise relevant to nuclear issues, such as knowledge in the areas of conflict resolution, bargaining, the facilitation of communication, and the research tools necessary to assess the psychological effects of the nuclear threat.

Enhanced public awareness has been reflected in an increase in the number of nuclear related survey items in public opinion polls (Fiske, Fischoff, & Milburn, 1983). Concomitantly, the psychological community has responded to this increased awareness with an upsurge of relevant research. For example, Pilisuk (1984) used a modification of the widely studied two person prisoners' dilemma game to simulate an arms race/disarmament dilemma. Pilisuk concluded that unilateral movements on a consistent basis effected change in the opposition's behavior, even in the absence of direct coercion and power. He also found that impediments to open communication, inherent in the game rules, resulted in participants' suspicion of one's opposition, and

speculated that the desire for competitive advantage may actually be a fear of the opposition taking a competitive advantage of oneself.

Schwebel (1982) investigated 3500 children's and adolescents' emotions and cognitions regarding the threat of nuclear war, and found an awareness of the threat of personal and global annihilation. Emotional reactions included terror, denial, resentfulness, bitterness, and feelings of helplessness. In light of these findings, Schwebel proposed guidelines for professionals in helping young people deal with their reactions. These include a need for professionals to become well-informed, professional availability for educational and emotional support, and improved methods for detecting those most in need of intervention.

Fiske, Pratto, and Pavelchak (1983) conducted a telephone survey which examined ordinary citizens' conceptions of nuclear war and the possible consequences of these conceptions for political activity. The conceptions were coded along a dimension of concreteness. Concrete images were defined as images that theoretically can be perceived by the senses and are particular, as opposed to general or abstract. They found that concreteness of images was positively correlated with anti-nuclear activity.

Tyler and McGraw (1983) assessed psychological antecedents of two groups of behavioral responses, anti-nuclear activism and survivalism. The authors found that individuals who believed that government and citizens have a causal and moral responsibility for nuclear war were more likely to be involved in the prevention of nuclear war than those who did not believe this principle. Furthermore, those subjects who

felt nuclear war is preventable were less likely to believe it is survivable and, in turn, were more likely to engage in anti-nuclear activism than those who did not. Conversely, those who believed nuclear war is not preventable were more likely to believe it is survivable and were more likely to engage in survivalist activities than those who did not.

The airing of the controversial television program "The Day After" stimulated a group of studies which examined the possible effects of this program on public consciousness at the 92nd Annual Convention of APA in Toronto, Ontario, in August 1984.

In light of the recent upsurge in nuclear-related research and the professional controversy, we wondered to what extent the Council's resolution reflected the attitude of the entire APA membership. Klineberg (1984), while recognizing that not all members were in agreement, asserted his belief that the resolution reflected the concerns of the vast majority of the membership. To date, such assertions have gone untested.

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the attitudes and behaviors of APA members concerning nuclear freeze/disarmament. For the purpose of this study, nuclear freeze/disarmament was defined as follows: "The U.S. and the U.S.S.R. should immediately stop the nuclear arms race. They should adopt a verifiable mutual freeze on all further testing, production, and deployment of all nuclear warheads, missles, and delivery systems. Bilateral, verifiable nuclear disarmament should then begin."

More specifically, the study tested three hypotheses:

(a) Psychologists age forty and under have lived their entire lives under the threat of nuclear war and might be particularly sensitive to the possibility of nuclear holocaust. According to Erikson's (1963) theory of life span development, those age sixty and above tend to reflect on their past experiences and personal growth and to contemplate the legacy they are bestowing on future generations. Thus, older psychologists may be more concerned about leaving an intact planet for posterity. Therefore, it was hypothesized that psychologists age forty and younger and those age sixty and older would be most likely to have attitudes and behaviors congruent with the resolution.

(b) Because there is evidence that women may be more sensitive to social issues than men (Block, 1983), it was hypothesized that female psychologists would be more likely than male psychologists to have attitudes and behaviors congruent with the resolution.

(c) As described above, Tyler and McGraw (1983) found that subjects who feel nuclear war is preventable were less likely to believe it is survivable and, in turn, were more likely to engage in anti-nuclear activities. Consequently, it was hypothesized that psychologists who do not want to survive an all-out nuclear war would be more likely to have attitudes and behaviors consistent with anti-nuclear activism than those who do want to survive.

The study also examined five exploratory questions: (a) Do APA members agree or disagree that psychologists should separate their roles as professionals from their roles as private citizens when

addressing the issue of nuclear freeze/disarmament? (b) Are the attitudes and behaviors of the APA membership congruent with the Council of Representatives' resolution? (c) Does professional identification or theoretical orientation make a difference with regard to APA members' attitudes? (d) Speculating that parents may be more inclined to have an investment in the future than non-parents, does having children influence respondents' attitudes and behaviors regarding nuclear freeze/disarmament? and (e) Having witnessed or felt the effects of the devastation of war, would respondents with first- or second-hand experience of war respond differently than those who report no experience regarding their desire to survive a nuclear war? First-hand experience of war was defined as military duty during wartime. Second-hand experience was defined as either military duty during peacetime or the personal effects of exposure to the ramifications of warfare, for example, having friends or relatives who were in combat or were killed in war, viewing graphic television news reports of the Vietnam conflict, and participating in anti-war activities.

Method

Subjects

The American Psychological Association provided a computer-selected random sample of 1,000 members. Of these members, a survey was received by 942 members. The survey was undeliverable to 58 members due to "addressee unknown", "moved with forwarding order expired", etc. A return rate of 31.5% (297) was achieved.

A survey requested information regarding respondents' age, gender, marital status, number of children, race/ethnicity, professional identification, theoretical orientation, and years of post-graduate experience in the field of psychology. The descriptive statistics for these variables are found in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Measure

Because we developed the 20-item questionnaire used in this study, there are no previous data concerning its reliability and validity. The content of the 20 items included personal and professional demographics (reported above), five Likert Scales assessing personal and professional attitudes, three open-ended items, and two checklists.

The Likert Scales required respondents to indicate the extent of their agreement (1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree) with the following items: (a) Psychologists should separate their roles as professionals from their roles as private citizens when addressing the issue of nuclear freeze/disarmament, (b) To speak out publicly as a psychologist (rather than as a private citizen) on the issue of nuclear disarmament is an inappropriate use of the professional role, (c) Promoting and protecting human welfare necessitates taking a stand as a psychologist in support of a nuclear freeze/disarmament, (d) I would like to see my local, state, and national psychology organizations address the issue of nuclear arms, and (e) Despite

individual efforts to avoid a nuclear war, it is inevitable.

The three open-ended items included: (a) Describe your first- or second-hand experience of war and how it has affected you, (b) If you checked "No activities," please comment on factors contributing to your non-involvement, and (c) Would you want to survive an all-out nuclear war? Why or why not? Percent perfect agreement between two independent codings of responses to the open-ended questions was 82%, 96%, and 90% respectively.

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate whether they had participated in the following activities as a private citizen and/or as a psychologist: (a) reading relevant literature, (b) distributing relevant literature, (c) signing petitions, (d) making financial contributions, (e) volunteering time in an organization to promote awareness of nuclear arms, (f) marches/demonstrations, (g) taking a leadership role to organize groups and activities, (h) informal discussions with others, and (i) no activities. They were also asked to indicate if they had given time, energy or money to: (a) Family Therapists for Peace, (b) National Peace Academy, (c) Physicians for Social Responsibility, (d) Psychologists for Social Responsibility, (e) Union of Concerned Scientists, and (f) Other.

Procedure

The survey was mailed, along with a cover letter, to the 1000 APA members in the sample. The cover letter explained the purpose of the survey, requested participation, and provided the definition of nuclear freeze/disarmament previously stated. A reminder mailing was sent approximately three months after the initial mailing to those who

had not returned a completed survey. Respondents were asked to check or to circle the response of their choice; comments were encouraged.

Results

Role Separation

Degree of agreement with the aforementioned Likert Scale item regarding psychologist/private citizen role separation is presented in Table 2. Combining the agree and strongly agree categories and

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

the disagree and strongly disagree categories, the results indicated that a majority of respondents were not supportive of psychologist/private citizen role separation (55.9% disagreed with role separation, 31.2% agreed with role separation).

Congruence with Resolution

The degree of agreement with the three Likert Scale items pertaining to The Inappropriateness of Public Statements, Promoting and Protecting Human Welfare, and Organization Addressing Nuclear Issues are also presented in Table 2. The finding indicated that the majority of psychologists agreed with the stance posited by the resolution. Combining the agree and strongly agree categories and the disagree and strongly disagree categories, 59.7% disagreed with the proposition that making public statements as psychologists on the issue of nuclear disarmament is an inappropriate use of the professional role, while 30.9% agreed with it. Fifty-one and a half percent agreed that promoting and protecting human welfare

necessitates taking a stand as a psychologist in support of a nuclear freeze/disarmament (34.9% disagreed). Furthermore, the majority of psychologists (62%) would like to see their local, state, and national psychology organizations address the issue of nuclear arms (27.2% disagreed).

Behavior Checklists

Responses to the two behavior checklists are summarized in Tables 3 and 4. The findings indicated that current peace-related activities

---

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

---

of the majority of psychologists include: reading relevant literature, signing petitions, and participating in informal discussions. However, the majority of respondents do not participate in the other activities included in the survey: distributing relevant literature, making financial contributions, volunteering time in an organization to promote awareness of nuclear arms, participating in marches/demonstrations, and taking a leadership role to organize groups and activities. As presented in Table 4, the majority of psychologists have not given time, energy, or money to the various peace-related professional organizations.

Professional Identification

A one-way (Professional Identification: Practitioner vs. Academic) analysis of variance of responses to the item which asked respondents to rate their desire to see their local, state, and national psychology organizations address the issue of nuclear arms

yielded a non-significant effect, $F(1,287) = 0.05$, $p > 0.05$.

Theoretical Orientation

A one-way (Theoretical Orientation: Humanisitic/Nonhumanistic) analysis of responses to the item which asked respondents to rate their desire to see their local, state, and national psychology organizations address the issue of nuclear arms yielded a significant effect, $F(1,295) = 10.17$, $p < 0.001$, indicating that psychologists with a Humanistic/Existential orientation were more likely than psychologists with other orientations (Behavioral and/or Cognitive, Psychodynamic and/or Freudian, Eclectic, and Other) to want their local, state, and national psychology organizations to address the issue of nuclear arms.

Parents versus Non-parents

A one-way (Number of Children) multivariate analysis of variance of respondents' attitudes about nuclear issues (the three Likert Scale items pertaining to: The Inappropriateness of Public Statements, Promoting and Protecting Human Welfare, and Organizations Addressing Nuclear Issues) yielded a non-significant effect, $F(9,783) = 0.67$, $p > 0.05$. However, a Pearson correlation coefficient indicated a weak relation between number of children and whether or not time, energy, or money was donated to Family Therapists for Peace ($r = 0.13$, $p < 0.05$) and the National Peace Academy ($r = 0.12$, $p < 0.05$).

Experience of War

A chi-square analysis indicated no relation between experience with war (no experience versus first- and second-hand experience) and

whether or not psychologists want to survive an all-out nuclear war ($\chi^2(1) = 0.02$, $p > 0.05$).

A one-way (Experience of War: First/Second Hand Experience vs. No Experience) multivariate analysis of variance of respondents' attitudes about nuclear issues (the three Likert Scale items pertaining to: The Inappropriateness of Public Statements, Promoting and Protecting Human Welfare, and Organizations Addressing Nuclear Issues) and the two behavior checklists yielded a non-significant effect, $F(18,274) = 1.51$, $p > 0.05$.

Age Group Effects

A one-way (Age Group: 20 to 39, 40 to 59, 60 to 89) multivariate analysis of variance of respondents' attitudes about nuclear issues (the three Likert Scale items pertaining to: The Inappropriateness of Public Statements, Promoting and Protecting Human Welfare, and Organizations Addressing Nuclear Issues) and the checklist assessing the donation of time, energy, or money to national organizations yielded a significant effect, $F(10,566) = 1.87$, $p < 0.05$. Subsequent one-way (Age Group) univariate analyses of variance were performed to determine the locus of the multivariate effect. Significant effects were obtained for National Peace Academy, $F(2,290) = 4.69$, $p < 0.05$, Physicians for Social Responsibility, $F(2,290) = 4.54$, $p < 0.05$, and Union of Concerned Scientists, $F(2,290) = 5.64$, $p < 0.05$. Post hoc comparisons (Student-Newman-Keuls) indicated that psychologists aged 60 to 89 were more likely ($p < 0.05$) than those aged 20 to 39 and 40 to 59 to give time, energy, or money to each organization.

A one-way (Age Group: 20 to 39, 40 to 59, 60 to 89) multivariate analysis of variance of the checklist assessing anti-nuclear activity yielded a significant effect, $F(18,574) = 2.19$, $p < 0.05$. Subsequent one-way (Age Group) univariate analyses of variance were performed to determine the locus of the multivariate effect. Significant univariate effects were obtained for reading relevant literature, $F(2,294) = 6.83$, $p < 0.001$, distributing relevant literature, $F(2,2949 = 3.07$, $p < 0.05$, and making financial contributions, $F(2,294) = 4.05$, $p < 0.05$. Post hoc comparisons (Student-Newman-Keuls) indicated that psychologists aged 60 to 89 were more likely ($p < 0.05$) than those aged 20 to 39 and 40 to 59 to read relevant literature, to distribute relevant literature, and to make financial contributions.

Gender Effects

A one-way (Gender) multivariate analysis of variance of respondents' attitudes about nuclear issues (the three Likert Scale items pertaining to: The Inappropriateness of Public Statements, Promoting and Protecting Human Welfare, and Organizations Addressing Nuclear Issues) and the checklist assessing the donation of time, energy, or money to national organizations yielded a non-significant effect, $F(9,282) = 1.15$, $p > 0.05$.

An additional one-way (Gender) multivariate analysis of variance of the checklist assessing respondents' anti-nuclear activities yielded a non-significant effect, $F(9,286) = 1.69$, $p > 0.05$, indicating no difference between male and female psychologists' level of activity in the following: reading relevant literature, signing petitions, participating in informal discussions, distributing

relevant literature, making financial contributions, volunteering time in an organization to promote awareness of nuclear arms, participating in marches/demonstrations, and taking a leadership role to organize groups and activities.

Prevention versus Survival

A one-way (Survival: Yes vs No) multivariate analysis of variance of respondents' attitudes about nuclear issues (the three Likert Scale items pertaining to: The Inappropriateness of Public Statements, Promoting and Protecting Human Welfare, and Organizations Addressing Nuclear Issues) and the two checklists assessing the donation of time, energy, or money to national organizations and the respondents' anti-nuclear activities yielded a significant effect, $F(18,234) = 2.44$, $p < 0.05$. Subsequent one-way (Survival) univariate analyses of variance were performed to determine the locus of the multivariate effect. Significant effects were obtained for The Inappropriateness of Public Statements, $F(18,234) = 13.53$, $p < 0.001$, Promoting and Protecting Human Welfare, $F(18,234) = 15.66$, $p < 0.001$, and Organizations Addressing Nuclear Issues, $F(18,234) = 28.61$, $p < 0.001$. The results indicated that psychologists who did not want to survive an all-out nuclear war were more likely than those who did want to survive to disagree with the statement that speaking out publicly as a psychologist is an inappropriate use of the professional role, to agree that promoting and protecing human welfare necessitates taking a stand as a psychologist in support of a nuclear freeze/disarmament, and to want their local, state, and national organizations to address the issue of nuclear arms.

Furthermore, significant effects were obtained for reading relevant literature, $F(18,234) = 7.19$, $p < 0.05$, signing petitions, $F(18,234) = 9.15$, $p < 0.05$, making financial contributions, $F(18,234) = 13.60$, $p < 0.001$, and participating in marches/demonstrations, $F(18,234) = 4.71$, $p < 0.05$. Psychologists who did not want to survive an all-out nuclear war were more likely to report being involved in these activities than those who did want to survive.

Significant effects were also obtained for Physicians for Social Responsibility, $F(18,234) = 12.43$, $p < 0.05$, Psychologists for Social Responsibility, $F(18,234) = 4.13$, $p < 0.05$, and Union of Concerned Scientists, $F(18,234) = 9.12$, $p < 0.05$. These findings indicated that psychologists who did not want to survive an all-out nuclear war were more likely to give time, energy, or money to these organizations than those who would want to survive.

Open-Ended Questions

In reference to the issue of surviving an all-out nuclear war, respondents were asked to comment on reasons why they would or would not want to survive. Categories of participants' responses are presented in Table 5. Of those who provided a reason

---

Insert Table 5 about here

---

for wanting to survive an all-out nuclear war, the most frequently occurring category of response addressed the intrinsic value of life at any cost. On the other hand, of those who provided a reason for

not wanting to survive, the largest percentage were concerned that life would be lacking in quality following a nuclear holocaust.

Those respondents who were not involved in anti-nuclear activities were asked to comment on factors contributing to their non-involvement. The categorization of these responses for the 76 psychologists who provided reasons is presented in Table 6.

Insert Table 6 about here

"Role strain" was defined as the individual having other priorities and lacking time, money, or energy. "It ain't my job" meant the person thought nuclear issues were best addressed by politicians and political scientists. "Apathy" referred to expressed feelings of indifference, learned helplessness, denial, and powerlessness. "Misuse of role" was defined as an inappropriate use of the professional role. Constraints due to age and/or health were categorized as "Age/health." "Tougher stance" meant the person believed in the deterrent effect of the nuclear arms race. Of the reasons provided by psychologists for their non-involvement, the greatest percentage fell into the "Role strain" category. Other frequently occurring categories included "Apathy" and "Tougher stance."

Discussion

Our results suggest that the attitudes and behaviors of the APA membership are congruent with the stance posited by the resolution. A majority of our sample did not agree with role separation, did not

agree that making public statements as psychologists on nuclear issues is inappropriate, did agree that promoting and protecting human welfare necessitates supporting nuclear freeze/disarmament, and would like psychology organizations to address nuclear arms issues. Activities congruent with the resolution, as reported by the majority of respondents, included reading relevant literature, signing petitions, and participating in informal discussions. These findings are consistent with those reported by Polyson, Stein, and Sholley (1984), in which a majority of APA members surveyed were in agreement with the decision by the Council of Representatives to endorse a bilateral Soviet-American nuclear weapons freeze.

Our findings suggest a difference in attitudes regarding nuclear issues across theoretical orientations. Humanistic/Existentialists were more likely than those of the other orientations to want their local, state, and national organizations to address the issue of nuclear arms. However, no comparable attitudinal difference was found across professional identification (Academic/Researchers, Practitioners, and Public Policy Activists).

Being a parent had no effect on psychologists' attitudes about nuclear issues. However, those with many children were somewhat more likely to give time, energy, or money to Family Therapists for Peace and the National Peace Academy than those with fewer children. Participants who reported first- or second-hand experience of war did not differ from those who reported no experience of war regarding their desire to survive a nuclear holocaust. Furthermore, these

groups did not differ in their attitudes and behaviors with respect to nuclear issues.

As predicted, older respondents gave more time, energy, or money to National Peace Academy, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and Union of Concerned Scientists. They also were likely to read and distribute relevant literature and to make financial contributions. Thus, it appears that older psychologists may indeed be more concerned about the legacy being left for future generations (Erikson, 1963). It is possible, however, that the age effect found may be attributed to other factors. For example, a number of respondents commented on the lack of time and energy which prevented them from being as actively involved as they would like to be. Thus, it could be speculated that younger respondents experience more demands upon their time and energy, which could have resulted in an artifact that older respondents appeared to be more actively involved in peace-related behaviors.

Our hypothesis that female psychologists would be more likely to have attitudes and behaviors congruent with the resolution was not supported by the data. In fact, no gender differences were found for any of the variables studied. One possible explanation for our study's failure to find gender differences is the proportionately low number of female respondents. As other research has shown that female APA members are more supportive of the resolution than male members (Polyson, et al., 1984), it is possible that gender differences would have been found if a more equal gender distribution had been obtained.

Our findings supported the hypothesis that respondents who did not want to survive an all-out nuclear war would be more likely to have attitudes and behaviors indicative of anti-nuclear activism. Conversely, those who would choose to survive were disinclined to engage in such activities. Our results corroborate those of Tyler and McGraw (1983) who speculated that "behaviors flow from a rational calculation, with citizens engaging in those behaviors that they feel will be effective." That is, those who believe prevention will be effective will act on that belief. On the other hand, those who want to survive are more likely to believe that survival behaviors will be effective, and may be more inclined to act in that direction. One may also consider such factors as apathy, indifference, and learned helplessness in explaining this phenomenon.

Sample bias may limit the generalizability of our findings. The mean age of our sample was 51 years; it is questionable as to whether this mean age is respresentative of the APA membership as a whole. Although actuarial statistics were available for gender comparisons, no additional demographic data was available for age, ethnicity/race, marital status, etc. It appeared that many of the early returns were from older respondents, many of whom indicated they were retired from full-time career activities. It may be that older respondents have more time available and feel less strained by their various role demands, and thus would be more likely to complete and to return a mail survey. Also, as in any mail survey, those who chose to respond were a self-selected group. It is possible that those who completed and returned the questionnaire may have had stronger feelings about

nuclear freeze/disarmament than those who failed to return the survey. Finally, no information was available on those from the initial sample who chose not to respond. Thus, it is unknown how this group would compare with the final sample.

A cursory examination of our findings regarding psychologists' anti-nuclear behaviors could lead one to conclude that psychologists are doing little to prevent nuclear war. Of the 13 specific behaviors included on our checklists, a majority of respondents were active only in reading relevant literature, signing petitions, and informal discussions with others. It is our perspective, however, that this current activity level represents a considerable investment in the fate of the earth. Although our behavior checklists were lengthy, they were not exhaustive, as indicated by comments by some respondents who added such activities as writing their Congressional representatives to our lists. This may suggest that psychologists' level of activism may be even greater than reflected in our results. In addition, it may be speculated that this degree of involvement compares favorably with that of other professions.

Our study, as well as that of Polyson et al. (1984), suggests that the APA membership is clearly in support of the resolution passed by the Council of Representatives. Thus, the controversy over the appropriateness of psychology's involvement as a profession is no longer the question. A review of the psychological literature reveals few studies relevant to nuclear arms. Clearly, more research is needed. However, there are data in the areas of conflict resolution, bargaining, facilitation of communication and group processes. It

has been postulated by a number of psychologists (e.g., Frank, 1981) that these are areas of psychological investigation pertinent to the nuclear threat. The issue becomes one of consolidating the existing data into a framework that can be marketed and utilized by those involved in the process of nuclear negotiations. It is also important to direct current and future research efforts along these same lines. In conclusion, it is our belief that the central issue is not one of nuclear war per se, but rather, the necessity of peace-making and peace-keeping.

References

Abeles, N. (1983). Proceedings of the American Psychological Association, Incorporated, for the year 1982. American Psychologist, 38 (6), 649-682.

Block, J.H. (1983). Differential premises arising from differential socialization of the sexes; some conjunctures. Child Development, 54, 1335-1354.

Erikson, E.H. (1963). Childhood and Society. (2nd ed.) New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

Fiske, S.T., Fischhoff, B., & Milburn, M.A. (1983). Images of nuclear war: an introduction. Journal of Social Issues, 39 (1), 1-6.

Fiske, S.T., Pratto, F., & Pavelchak, M.A. (1983). Citizens' images of nuclear war: content and consequences. Journal of Social Issues, 39 (1), 41-65.

Frank, J.D. (1982). Sanity and Survival in the Nuclear Age. New York: Random House.

Klineberg, O. (1984). Public opinion and nuclear war. American Psychologist, 39 (11), 1245-1253.

Lifton, R.J. (1982). Beyond psychic numbing: a call to awareness. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52 (4), 619-629.

Pilisuk, M. (1984). Experimenting with the arms race. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 28 (2), 296-315.

Polyson, J., Stein, D., & Sholley, B. (1984, August). Psychologists and nuclear war: a survey. In S. Oskamp (Chair) Before and after "The Day After". Symposium conducted at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.

Rogers, C.R. (1982, August). Nuclear war: a personal response. APA Monitor, p. 6-7.

Schwebel, M. (1982). Effects of the nuclear war threat on children and teenagers: implications for professionals. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52 (4), 608-618.

Staff. (1983, October). Peace efforts should be practical. APA Monitor, p. 12.

Staff. (1982, September 27). Nuclear disarmament resolution approved by APA Council of Representatives. Behavior Today, p. 8.

Tyler, T.R., & McGraw, K.M. (1983). The threat of nuclear war: risk interpretation and behavioral response. Journal of Social Issues, 39 (1), 25-40.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	S.D.	Range	Number	Percent
Age in years	51.0	14.8	28-29		
Years experience	18.8	12.9	0-54		
Number of children	1.6	1.5	0-10		
Gender:					
Males				227	77.0
Females				69	23.0
Marital status:					
Married				212	71.0
Single				48	16.0
Unmarried cohabitating				10	3.4
Divorced				22	7.4
Separated				5	1.7
Race/ethnicity:					
Caucasian				276	93.0
Black				5	1.7
Hispanic				2	0.7
American Indian				1	0.3
Other				13	4.4
Professional identification:					
Academic/researcher				122	41.5
Practitioner				167	56.8
Public policy activist				5	1.7

Table 1 (cont.)

	Number	Percent
Theoretical orientation:		
Behavioral/cognitive	111	37.4
Psychodynamic	36	12.1
Existential/humanistic	21	7.1
Eclectic	99	33.3
Other	30	10.1

Table 2

Response Percentages on Likert Scale Attitude Items

	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Neither	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree
Role Separation	19.0	12.2	12.9	30.8	25.1
Public Statements Promote and Protect Organizations	18.0	12.9	9.5	29.5	30.2
Address Issue	27.8	23.7	13.6	15.9	19.0
Inevitability of Nuclear War	30.0	32.0	10.8	9.4	17.8
	1.3	6.7	15.5	41.1	35.4

Table 3

Response Percentages for Nuclear Freeze/Disarmament Activities

	% As Private Citizen	% As Both	% As Psychologist	Total % Yes	Total % No
Read	54.2	3.0	21.9	79.1	20.9
Distribute	10.4	0.7	4.7	15.8	84.2
Sign Petitions	41.8	2.7	9.1	53.5	46.5
Give Money	29.3	2.7	7.1	39.1	60.9
Volunteer	7.7	1.7	6.1	15.5	84.5
March/Demonstrate	15.8	0.3	4.0	20.2	79.8
Lead Groups	4.7	2.4	3.0	10.1	89.9
Discuss	36.7	2.4	28.3	67.3	32.7
No Activity	5.7	3.4	8.1	17.2	82.8

Table 4

Percentage of Respondents Supporting Organizations

	Total % Yes	Total % No
Family Therapists for Peace	0.3	99.7
National Peace Academy	4.7	95.3
Physicians for Social Responsibility	10.8	89.2
Psychologists for Social Responsibility	8.4	91.6
Union of Concerned Scientists	16.8	83.2
Other	16.6	83.4

Table 5

Categorization of Survival Comments

	Total Number	Percent
Want To Survive:		
Life is precious at any cost	45	15.2
Be there to help	10	3.4
Curiosity	9	3.0
New beginning for humanity	8	2.7
No reason given	59	19.9
Would Not Want To Survive:		
Lack of quality of life	56	18.9
Impossibility of survival	14	4.7
No reason given	40	13.5
Undecided:		
Too hypothetical/speculative	15	5.0
Depends on conditions/who else survives	19	6.4
No reason given	22	7.4

Table 6

Factors Contributing to Non-Involvement

	Total Number	Percent
Role strain	23	30.3
It ain't my job	4	5.3
Apathy	17	22.3
Misuse of role	8	10.5
Age/health	11	14.5
Tougher stance	13	17.1